

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

---

2021 ND 202

---

In the Interest of J.M., a child  
State of North Dakota,

Petitioner and Appellee

v.

J.M., child,  
and

Respondent

R.M., father; S.M., mother,

Respondents and Appellants

---

No. 20210268

---

In the Interest of J.M., a child  
State of North Dakota,

Petitioner and Appellee

v.

J.M., child,  
and

Respondent

R.M., father; S.M., mother,

Respondents and Appellants

---

No. 20210269

---

In the Interest of J.M., a child  
State of North Dakota,

Petitioner and Appellee

v.

J.M., child,  
and

Respondent

R.M., father; S.M., mother,

Respondents and Appellants

---

No. 20210270

---

In the Interest of J.M., a child  
State of North Dakota,

Petitioner and Appellee

v.

J.M., child,  
and

Respondent

R.M., father; S.M., mother,

Respondents and Appellants

---

No. 20210271

---

In the Interest of J.M., a child  
State of North Dakota,

Petitioner and Appellee

v.

J.M., child,  
and

Respondent

R.M., father; S.M., mother,

Respondents and Appellants

---

No. 20210272

---

Appeal from the Juvenile Court of Dickey County, Southeast Judicial District,  
the Honorable Daniel D. Narum, Judge.

AFFIRMED.

Per Curiam.

Kimberly J. Radermacher, State's Attorney, Edgeley, ND, for petitioner,  
respondent, and appellee.

Justin M. Balzer (appeared), Bismarck, ND, for respondent and appellant  
R.M., father.

Mary E. Depuydt, Wishek, ND, for respondent and appellant S.M., mother.

**Interest of J.M.  
Nos. 20210268-20210272**

**Per Curiam.**

[¶1] R.M., father, and S.M, mother, appeal from a juvenile court order terminating their parental rights to their five minor children, all of whom have the initials J.M. R.M. and S.M. both argue the district court erred when it found they subjected the children to aggravated circumstances and that deprivation of the children is likely to continue. S.M. argues the findings specific to her conduct alone are not adequate to show aggravated circumstances.

[¶2] The record establishes the juvenile court's findings are supported by clear and convincing evidence and are not clearly erroneous. *See In re A.L.E.*, 2018 ND 257, ¶ 4, 920 N.W.2d 461 (the elements required for termination of parental rights must be established by clear and convincing evidence; we apply the clearly erroneous standard of review to the juvenile court's findings). Based on our review of the record, we conclude the court did not abuse its discretion when it terminated R.M. and S.M.'s parental rights. *See In re B.H.*, 2018 ND 178, ¶ 4, 915 N.W.2d 668 (when the petitioner has met its burden, the court has discretion in determining whether termination of parental rights would promote the child's welfare).

[¶3] We summarily affirm under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(2) and (4).

[¶4] Jon J. Jensen, C.J.  
Gerald W. VandeWalle  
Daniel J. Crothers  
Lisa Fair McEvers  
Jerod E. Tufte